DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 051 005 SO 000 970

AUTHOR	Mallery, David; Heath, Douglas H.
TITLE	Toward a More Human School. A Report on Five Conferences Involving Students, Teachers, and Administrators.
INSTITUTION	National Association of Independent Schools, Boston, Mass.
PUB DATE	70
NOTE	44p.
AVAILABLE FROM	National Association of Independent Schools, Four Liberty Square, Boston, Massachusetts 02109 ($1.25)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Activism, Affective Behavior, Communication Problems, *Educational Change, School Community Relationship, Self Concept, *Student Alienation, Student Attitudes, *Student School Relationship, *Student Teacher Relationship, Values

ABSTRACT

A series of five conferences are reported here on the problem of making the school more human by increasing understanding, the sense of community, and communication between students, teachers, and administrators. The first conferences explored the areas of necessary change which 275 students and 175 adults wanted to examine in the four remaining conferences. As a result these conferences were devoted to the general theme of alienation and ways of communicating to overcome this estrangement. In addition, a special article by Douglas Health on alienation and the school is appended. (CWB)

ED051005

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
RAY POTTER, Pres. NAIS
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

TOWARD A MORE HUMAN SCHOOL

A Report on Five Conferences Involving
Students, Teachers, and Administrators

by
DAVID MALLERY
Director of Studies
National Association of Independent Schools

With an Appendix by
DOUGLAS H. HEATH
Professor of Psychology
Haverford College

SP 000 970

COPYRIGHT © 1970, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced in any form without permission in writing from the publisher, except by a reviewer who may quote brief passages in a review to be printed in a magazine or newspaper.

CONTENTS

Chapter I	THE REAL SUBJECT OUT IN THE OPEN	5
Chapter II	THE DEVELOPING STYLE OF THE CONFERENCES	9
Chapter III	COMING TOGETHER ON ISSUES AND CONCERNS	15
Chapter IV	DOUGLAS HEATH AND "DAVID AND LISA"	21
Chapter V	BACK IN THE SCHOOLS . . .	26
Appendix	STUDENT ALIENATION AND SCHOOL by DOUGLAS H. HEATH	34

I

THE REAL SUBJECT OUT IN THE OPEN

"WE thought we were making all the right moves—we got the neckties and coats off, we stopped hassling about long hair, we made chapel optional, we put in a lot of new curricular changes with 'relevant' materials, we recast the whole student government business—and now we look around and find we *still* have a cold, inhuman school. . . ." A teacher in his early thirties was talking in a group of six students and four adults who had been meeting off and on for two days to share their views of school, of the problems and opportunities, of next steps and old exasperations and new hopes. There was extraordinary trust alive in that little room, apparently a partially converted broom closet. The teacher speaking had come on rather strongly in the group's first meeting, with a good deal of Camus and Martin Buber, which by now had given way to some searching about what really made school something better than "a cold, inhuman place." Faces and bodies were alert in that group, not just ears and minds. All ten people were new to each other, coming from schools scattered between San Francisco and Maryland, with one person from Hawaii and one from Canada stretching the too familiar in-school insularity still further. There had been no gimmicks to get the group to do anything: no hand holding, ear-lobe feeling, trading of insults or confessions. It was just a group of strangers meeting together to talk about things that concerned them, things they would like to see happen in their schools. These people weren't self-consciously stretching themselves across any generation gap. Often there was more argument between sixteen-year-olds than between a sixteen-year-old and a fifty-year-old. And when this particular collection of ten people really arrived at some kind of crucial point, it was with the young teacher's face, voice, and comment about the "cold, inhuman school." Where they went from there, in the next day and night, somehow acted out, for those ten, something that was very far indeed from cold and inhuman, something that one of the students described as "a feeling of community that we have with each other here—that we ought to be able to take back to school."

This was a fragment of a conference–such a dreary word to many school people, though this one was not dreary, and nobody thought up a new name for it. It was one of five National Association of Independent Schools conferences which, during 1969 and 1970, have brought students or teachers or administrators from two hundred schools around the country for a three-day conversation, which we see now–though it was never on any program or schedule–was really about how people can work together to make a more human school.

As someone who is in and out of a lot of conversations with schools and school people–students, teachers, and administrators–I find that the subject of how those under and over twenty-one can work together to make a more human school is really *the* subject closest to people's deepest caring. And I don't think it is a matter of this year's fashion, something to have seminars about when you have had the seminars in other years about advanced placement, required courses, overemphasis on college admissions, the renovated senior year, independent study, getting-out-into-the-community, individualized instruction, redesigning the schedule (with or without the computer), rewriting the curriculum, revising the constitution for student government, and introducing mini-courses. None of these should ever be looked on as educational whims or fads, even though they surface in conferences and seminars so that "everybody" seems to be talking about them and making some kind of sortie into them. It may be that at the heart of all the post-sputnik questioning of the newly stepped-up academics, of all that excitement about "excellence" being equated to more and harder activity with books, paper, and pencil is just this concern: how to make school more human. It is odd that it took us all so long to be explicit about it, really to come out and say it, as I hear, so often now, headmasters and ninth-graders, English teachers and psychologists, educational commentators and students who are or are not on the student council saying it. I think we used to be a little embarrassed about sounding unacademic, unintellectual, undignified. It somehow wasn't "cool," in the 1950's and even the 1960's sense, to be talking about making an institution and its life "more human." It was more protected, more comfortable, for many of us to focus on something objective-sounding and outlineable–a shift from "teaching for facts" to "teaching for concepts" in history, a new organization for student government's activities, a rewrite job on the dress code, a new course in Russian, Chinese, psychology, history of Southeast Asia (for very bright seniors who could schedule it).

I should like to think–and I really believe–that a great many of those

innovations in the schools during the last five or six years were not an evasion of the central human concerns that so many educational planners, administrators, and teachers carried around with them, concerns that got them into education in the first place. All this may really have been, in many places, a way to get at the matter of morale, atmosphere, community, "humanness," even though students or adults were not yet at home with talking and thinking directly about those hazy and perhaps sentimental-sounding notions. And those innovations, in many cases, may have carried schools into something richer and more personal and more nourishing to their "lives." But it is clear that the talk and the action now, within schools and about schools, is not just organizational, strategic, maneuvering, mechanical, "academic." If the kind of exchange and exploration and beginnings of new kinds of trust that we have seen in the past year can lead schools to this "more human" state, as it is clearly trying to do, then I am very hopeful that the arteries in our schools have not hardened, the lines between young and adult, swingers and traditionalists, have not been drawn finally, the walls between camps have not been built so solidly that it is too late for any coming together of human beings to work on problems, to recognize each other, and to make a school life worth living, an education worth having, in a world where changes and intensities and fears and frightening rhetoric on all sides can make us hold our breaths.

This report simply deals with five conferences in which these matters were discussed among students and teachers and administrators. The first of them, titled "Student Concern and Institutional Response," had a solemn and respectable title that seemed quite appropriate a little over a year ago, and people signed up for it in droves and came with some trepidation and some good will. The title today seems a little pretentious. Also, it doesn't fit what has developed around the schools and in these conferences in the past year. For one thing, we seem to have gone a lot farther than feeling that the answer to school troubles lies in Finding Out About Students' Concerns. *Everybody* who is half-way awake, from kindergarteners to teachers and administrators well past retirement age, has "concerns" about schools, about themselves, about what should be going on in schools and what part he can play in the school community which can count for something. More than that, we aren't talking about *students'* having concerns, or students' acting, and *institutions'* responding. It is by now not exactly novel to think of institutions as being made up of the people in them. This doesn't mean that the eighth grade has to vote on the divisions of the school budget or the front hall paint color. It does mean that the institution grows and changes and gets better by the

coming-together efforts of the people–the human beings–in them. This involves a lot of different styles, skills, responsibilities, roles, and functions, but it is clearly the developing vision of a school community which we are seeing and hearing about so much now. The journey through these five conferences, the kind of things that were brought to them and shared in them, and the changing subjects, approaches, and relationships which they have unfolded, has provided a fascinating experience for those of us who have had a part in all five, and who are now wrestling with the "so-what" and "what-now"–animated, not just by a set of conferences, but by a whole developing vision of what school is about and what school should be. What follows will be simply fragments of these experiences, voices and faces, concerns and ways of coming together, and ways of moving ahead. Most of the conferences were three days long, and the things we hear from the students, teachers, and administrators back in their schools afterward are often random, hasty, fragmentary–and often enormously heartening. So we offer no deep study of five conferences, their content and impact. Instead, we hope to suggest some approaches, styles, experiences that have been shared and explored by some 275 students and 175 adults from schools around the country and beyond, with some notes on what we see and hear happening in the schools along with (not necessarily because of) these conferences.

II

THE DEVELOPING STYLE OF THE CONFERENCES

THE first of the five conferences was exploratory: we wanted to hear those "student concerns," and we were still thinking of "institutional response" as what The Others did once they heard the student concerns. This conference was described in a report I wrote in 1969,[1] and it did a lot for us in spelling out some of the student concerns, but it did a lot more in telling us how ready and eager students and teachers and administrators are to get together and talk about schools, if only we could develop better and better ways to set the scene, so that they could do this with openness and honesty and respect for each other's humanity. The topic, Student Concerns and Institutional Response, sounded so "with-it" in the spring of 1969, understandably, that we found far more than half of the group of one hundred were adults, and far more than half of those were headmasters. Added to that, we had a lot of brass: members of various NAIS committees who were interested to see what would develop at the conference and how they might carry away some useful ideas and approaches into their NAIS activities, as well as in their own schools. Thus, it took a while before any but the most confident students would speak up in the whole-group sessions, and the headmasters, experienced and at home in speaking up, either spoke up or complained that the students "weren't blasting us enough." It is fascinating to see, in looking back with the perspective of the subsequent four conferences and the developments in schools around the country since January 1969, that the adults assumed, at that first conference, that the students' role would be only to blast the grown-ups, and that the teachers' and administrators' role would be to listen dutifully (or to respond institutionally, if they were serious about the conference title). But given that first conference's overload of adults and of brass, and also the relatively short time (a day and a half, with the evening devoted to a speaker), we did find some real beginnings of exchange and searching together in the small groups of about fourteen, which met three

[1] *Toward a New Partnership* by David Mallery, published by NAIS in April, 1969 (now out of print).

times during the conference. And more than the actual issues that emerged from these groups, the spirit that developed in some of them suggested the idea of partnership in a way that was new and exciting to many people there. The action was clearly in those groups, and the key to that action was ***sharing***. The idea of the adults' listening while the students unloaded their concerns shifted to a real exchange. In the group I was in, a boy made this very clear near the beginning, after a headmaster said, "Now let's hear what the *students* think. I just want to listen." He had surely been reading all the right articles about how adults–particularly school administrators–didn't listen to students and, instead, talked and told, preached and proclaimed. So while he was trying dutifully to do right, he was taken aback, at first, as most of the adults were, when a boy answered him: "I don't want you to just sit there and listen to the Young People. I want to know what *you* think too. I want you to stick your neck out. I'm not going to stick mine out unless you stick yours out too." That was an important turning point, and really announced the spirit of the four subsequent conferences.

In the next four conferences, at least half of the group were students, usually closer to two-thirds. A school could send either two students *or* a teacher *or* an administrator. Thus, most of the people were strangers to each other, free to speak as themselves, not necessarily as a member of a school. We found that headmasters, as well as students and teachers, were grateful for this freedom to speak as themselves, with no one there ready to say, "But you said . . . " the next week. From the applications we worked out a balance between coed and single sex schools, day and boarding schools, relatively conservative and relatively innovative schools. We also had a geographical range that was delightful and refreshing, with people coming from both coasts and many states in between, plus Hawaii, Canada, and the Virgin Islands.

In the early conferences, we drew many student council leaders and headmasters; but later, a number of schools sent students who were interesting and interested, but were neither student leaders nor valedictorians, and we saw more young teachers and assistant principals and department chairmen as we went along. In some schools, the head simply chose who was to come. In others, particularly later on, we began to hear about student elections to see which students would attend, once the head had decided to send student representatives. Of the nearly two hundred schools that were involved, a number sent a teacher to one and students to another, and the fifth conference brought the first set of students who eagerly showed notes and descriptions of the changes in their school's student government design and style which had begun with the efforts of two older students from the

19

Some of the hardier adults and students were locked in conversation far into the night and early morning. I had to wake up one of the group leaders, a young teacher at a mid-West school, in time for the start of a final morning session. He and a few others had been talking until 5:30 a.m., then had gone to sleep. Five students and the one other teacher made it to the morning session, looking quite refreshed. The group leader rushed in a little late, bleary-eyed.

Meals were at tables for about eight. Nobody made a point of mixing students and adults, but somehow there almost always turned out to be a mixture. Sometimes, a meal would end quickly, and people would take off to other conversations, or a walk in whatever grounds there were. Other times, a table of people would be eagerly at it long after the last coffee cup had been cleared away.

As for between-times sessions, we realized by the end of the third conference that we needed more unscheduled time. Some of us began to find that talk was not enough, or that it ran dry, or that it was a kind of groping for something else. A deserted motel swimming pool helped once; a tour of part of the University of Chicago campus, another time; a spring afternoon out on the field in front of the conference center in Maryland, still another. But we see more and more that there needs to be something more that people can do together between talk sessions, and as this is written we are planning the sixth of these conferences, which will include a morning and early afternoon with Outward Bound. I have seen the Outward Bound people working with wiry students and paunchy principals, each going up the same tree or helping each other figure out how to get from here to there, and it seemed to us that it would be worthwhile to interrupt the talk with some of the sharing and trying and extraordinary working-together in partnership which seems more and more to be crucial to the present Outward Bound philosophy and practice. Robert Lentz, an independent school teacher and administrator up to 1969, and now on the Outward Bound staff, was a group leader at the second of these conferences and is planning the Outward Bound experience tailored to this particular NAIS venture.

This is a good deal on how people behaved, how they worked, talked, sat, dressed, actually came together. During and after the first conference, I was making notes about what people *said*, and got all the material from the other group leaders and other participants I could get hold of about what people had *said* in their discussions. Now after the fifth one, and writing a report on the whole experience, I find I am writing first about what happened, the *style* of the coming-together, the nature of the experience these five collections of

students-teachers-administrators actually made together. What they said to each other is important and may be leading to some useful explorations and changes in the schools. But I have the feeling that what happened, what the experience of the three days was like for those there, is even more important and more resonant, somehow, than anyone's list of topics or concerns or suggested plans. When a boy walked out of the final session of the second conference and said, elated, to the people around him, "This is the greatest thing since Woodstock!" I was floored—for a moment. A while later I began to see what he was trying to say. For him, there had been a kind of sharing of humanity, a kind of freedom to be one's self and see the selves of others with respect and appreciation in both experiences, in spite of some of the obvious differences between the two. And there is not much of that kind of experience in general supply. If these conferences can make it possible for students and adults to work out their own community experience together, a community of three-day strangers, perhaps the real longing for "community," for coming together, in our schools can be nourished all the better with this experience as a kind of sample or opening of the doors.

III

COMING TOGETHER ON ISSUES AND CONCERNS

CRUCIAL to these five encounters was the fact that the NAIS staff did not design a list of agenda and present it at the start of any of the conferences. I believe that if we did one thing right, it was that. Not everyone agrees on this. A few have said, or written, that things got too diffuse, the conversation in the small groups got either too detailed ("What is your mechanism for selecting tenth-grade representatives for student council?") or too broad ("What is the purpose of education?"). Actually, it strikes me that neither of those questions is out of order, but no one can guarantee that any group of six or seven students and three or four adults, locked in for, say, four different two-hour sessions, will build something on such questions which will be useful. Those who came to these conferences surely needed to identify *themselves* what the key issues of concern to them actually were, and to hear from a few others, at least, some other issues or some sympathetic vibrations to the issues already placed on the table by whoever was talking.

Thus, we started each of the last four conferences with some sort of interesting and challenging but wide-ranging experience that would get some productive talk going. Sometimes, it was a case study in one room for half the group (fifty in each for the largest of the conferences, thirty for the smallest) and a half-hour film in another. The case study, one of those prepared for the NAIS Administrative Seminars, got good talk going mainly because the leaders were real virtuosos (John Seiler, John Matthews, Gordon Marshall, from the Harvard Business School faculty). But the case itself, dealing with black students, a dining hall table, and a student demonstration, seemed relatively cold to the group. Designed for headmasters, it "just didn't tell enough that we needed to know," as we heard again and again. The film we used, however, is as sure-fire a talk-starter as I have ever encountered: the Canadian Film Board's "No Reason to Stay." It presents a bright, lively boy's day in school, through each class, in conversations with his girl, his mother, his guidance counselor ("What are you doing in that file, sir?" "I'm looking to see what your marks are." "My marks are good, sir. I'm great at

memorizing. I'm just not learning anything."), and finally, before his flight down the hall and out of the school, his brief encounter with the door—only that—of the principal's office. Woven in between these scenes are hilarious or touching or appalling fantasies the boy has—a mass trial for his teacher, based on alleged sarcasm and tediousness; scenes from the TV news of brutality to black protesters and bombings of Vietnamese women and children; an imagined graduation scene with wild applause for the hero; the imagined responses of faces—from mother to the prime minister—to the news of his dropping out. In a half-hour, this rather modest film, written by an eighteen-year-old boy and made by colleagues at the Canadian Film Board, started enough talk, broke the formalities and the ice easily enough, and launched enough vital topics and healthy controversy so that we could move into the small groups and dig right in where people needed to dig.

In each of the small groups, the leader would simply ask something like this at the start: "What are some of the issues or concerns you would like to make sure get discussed in our group—and in the whole conference?" Especially after the opening airings of school issues in the case and the film, people were ready to plunge in without much fencing around. It was heartening—and often touching—to see how quickly the students and adults got across the feeling to each other that they *each* had concerns and that they expected to explore them together. Tentative in the first conference, this was emphatic in the subsequent ones. Here is a sample of one group's beginning in the fifth conference. These concerns were hastily noted down by the leader as they came, with some long waits sometimes "so that we surely get at least out on the table the things that really need to be there for these three days." Until the first list was completed—at least for the moment—we had no discussion of any of these topics. If we had, we should have been off and running on the first or second topic, but a lot might have been lost with the later ones left unspoken.

"What is education supposed to do?"

"What is the private school's commitment to the community outside?"

"Things get so set in school—you feel locked in."

"Who controls what happens in school?"

"School's experiences are so separate. When do they all come together and how?"

"Preparation for college is all anyone cares about." ("I'd kill myself to get into my first choice." "My God—do you hear what you're saying?")

"How do you relate that book, this paper, that course, to the world, to your life, to what's going on outside the window?"

"How much is it up to students to hang in there and keep trying to change the school?"

"Getting required stuff finished and making a more adventurous senior year."

"Being black in a mostly white school."

"Work out in the world and work with school books–how can we bring them together?"

"New courses–environmental science–Black Studies–work-study plans that take you in and out of school. . . ."

"Grades, comments, evaluation."

"Pressures: dog-eat-dog, the drive to score on tests–admissions–getting in the right social group. . . ."

"Why do you do well in a course? Is it the teacher's personality? How good you are in the subject? Grades? Fear?"

"Incentives–what are some–for doing well, for being alive to things in school–for coming out of apathy . . . ?"

"Student apathy."

"What is worth learning? What is worth doing?"

"Covering ground in a course–'We haven't time to get into that' and 'That's off the subject.' "

"Special programs for the 'best' students. Who gets the goodies?" "The school has overorganized our time schedule."

"*Choice* in school: in courses, activities, projects, personal style."

"What is a young person's responsibility in relation to other kids, teachers, parents, institutions. . .?"

"Being really *known* in school. . . ."

"Can you come on as yourself in school? Or do you have to play a role?"

"What is school spirit, and how do you get it?"

"Sex education."

"Drugs."

"My identity and school."

"Sensitivity as a technique for getting people to know each other in a school. . . ."

"What are the barriers that separate people in school?"

"Isolation and boredom."

"Community–students, teachers, administrators, parents. . . ."

Sometimes, these concerns would tumble forward, one on top of the other. Sometimes, there would be a long silence between. Someone would say, "We've got enough already. Let's get started." But we tried to keep away

from "getting started" as long as anyone might have still another concern or subject he thought should be in the conversation. Many of the groups, especially in the first conferences, could have been locked into "What is your voting system?" and "What is the hair length limit?" if these lists had been cut off before people were ready to begin, or comfortable enough to get out their special concern. Of course, there were some who couldn't get their "real" concern out in the first meeting, and things had to be kept open and hospitable for just such a person to come in with his thusfar unspoken concern at any of the later small-group sessions.

What do you do when you end up with a list like that one? Five minutes on each topic? When a group hears someone read back a list like that, it is both awesome and funny. And one of the best things that happened again and again in these sessions was that people saw that the topics were often so massive, or so complex, or so interrelated, that they couldn't be neatly dealt with as if they were simply agenda, which a group could work through and even come up at the end with a set of neat conclusions, beginning "Our group felt. . . ." This made for some frustrations, but also for some very special satisfactions, since there was plenty left to take home and try out in conversations at school, plenty of different ways of opening up problems and questions, and, most important, a sense that school is not simply a set of problems to wrestle with, or a few issues to fight about, but a whole world of feelings and experiences and opportunities and troubles and hopes in which people of all ages are involved, as themselves, and not just as students of French, teachers of mathematics, football captains, oddballs, deans, council leaders, or members huddled under the classifications of students, teachers, and administrators.

As each group worked and talked together, they developed their own style and approach. Some dug into specific concerns, some explored all around their list and beyond. One got into playing some physical lifting and supporting games at the end, and still another dropped all their experience-swapping and spent their last two sessions on building a wholly new school—how they would do it, what it would be like, how they would build into it the experiences and values they thought most crucial.

Sometimes, the talk got very depressing. After one session I saw a teacher in the elevator, obviously devastated by what had gone on in her group. I asked her about it, and she answered, "We've just been two hours on drugs—I had no idea there was that much discouragement, that much desperation among students. And what got to me most was their eagerness to talk about these things with adults—with the four of us in that group—things they said

they couldn't talk about with the adults back at school and yet wanted so desperately to." There were moments of searing unhappiness about the inhumanity of the life in a school: in the relationship of students to each other ("No one dares to be honest with anybody else. They're afraid of being clobbered. . . .") or of students and teachers to each other. (*A student:* "They are so wrapped up in their academic thing they don't know who's in the room." *A teacher:* "They keep us at arm's length–they don't want to recognize anything human in us–sometimes, as if that would spoil the comfort of their closed opinions about teachers.") Important issues dying in interminable committee meetings; arbitrary regulations that "made no sense"; obsession with institutional and personal "image"; the desperation that students felt when there is no option for another view, another feeling, in "what passes for class discussion"; the difficulty that comes of a teacher's being loyal to The School and loyal to individual students who have confidence in him; a headmaster's struggle with a faculty that polarizes into Young Turks and Old Guard; loneliness; feeling helpless while a big monolithic institution "tried to put you in a mould";–such concerns rang in these conversations with far more intensity than standard gripes. Sometimes, someone in a group could help ease some of these frustrations or throw some different-colored light on them. Sometimes not. But there was genuine exchange, genuine sharing of really troubled feelings, and the beginnings of some opening of the way to go at them back in the very different schools.

Some of the talk was exuberant, an exulting enthusiasm for some part of a school's life or style or some people in it which someone, most often a student, was eager to share. This was not an "everything's just great in *our* school" kind of cheerleading enthusiasm, but a thoughtful, measured look at something that was important and heartening in a school's life: a teacher who reached across or around the desk and "recognized" the student, and was recognized himself in return; a special project that took a student into the community "to do real work in the world–and have it respected"; a feeling of being trusted–by a headmaster, a teacher, a student, a sense of there having been something significant a person could do in the school to affect the school–the exact opposite of the terrible hopelessness someone else might be expressing about "being able to do anything" in the school.

What was most surprising was the change, almost measurable in some mysterious way, from preoccupation with rules, hair, grades, infringements on identity which so dominated the first of the conferences toward an increasingly evident preoccupation with what came to be called "community," and an eagerness to act out this "community" at the

conference, and not just talk about how it might be achieved in school. I saw a steady progression from the first to the fifth conference from an us-them attitude between students and adults to a "we" or community feeling including both groups. In each conference we all saw often a dramatic shifting from us-them to "we," but in the later ones we seemed to *start* with much less us-them and move all the more quickly and compellingly to a significant "we" both at the conference and in what people had to say about what they were determined to take back home.

All of us at these conferences may be kidding ourselves in our sense that this "we" business for three days has any importance the next week, or month, or year. But as we have seen it develop, among strangers who have never seen each other before and who have no history of cooperation or confrontation, partnership or enmity, we have become more and more convinced that it is this kind of spirit, back in the schools, in the middle of the irritations and pettinesses, the overfamiliar faces and voices, which will make our schools more effective, more alive, more human. No manifestoes, lists, schemes for change, cooked up among strangers in some kind of think-tank, will do it. So many schools now are groping for a community life and an individual life that are somehow richer and more nourishing than the life they are turning away from. They are beginning anew in bringing together the fragments, often lonely and isolated, sometimes discouraged and embattled, of their community, to *do* something and to *be* something significant within that community and enriching to the community beyond it. In these little groups in corners of motels and conference centers around the country, we have seen the beginnings of this kind of doing and being which may have reverberations that matter, beyond those groups, and even beyond the schools themselves.

IV

DOUGLAS HEATH AND "DAVID AND LISA"

IF we have overrated the value of talk, we shouldn't abandon it entirely and plunge blindly into whatever the next thing is that is supposed to bring understanding or communication. Where talk goes barren is when it is not "about" anything that people care about, when it is not linked up with feelings and thoughts that are alive in the talkers. We had some experiences, now fashionably and rather repellingly referred to as "inputs," which we hoped would touch these feelings and thoughts that were alive in the people who came to the conferences. The case study and "No Reason to Stay" film were ice-breakers, ways of making clear that a whole range of concerns was available for these three days' exploration, and an invitation to bring forward some more. The fact that we talked about the case and the film in groups as big as fifty made for some frustrations and some illuminations, since that many people could have a sense of the range of practices and styles, feelings, and approaches, reflected from a two-year-old school in Oregon and a three hundred-year-old school in Massachusetts, or from a student who had had it in his school and another who had come alive in his, or a teacher who was wrestling with what his role in the school was and a headmaster who was exploring new meanings for responsibility. These large-group sessions launched the little clusters of ten or twelve where the real searching went on. But we returned again and again from these sessions to experiences for everybody, and the response to these everybody-together sessions was vital to what happened next in the small-group sessions and in the conference itself.

The central "everybody" experience in the second, third, fourth, and fifth conferences was Douglas Heath's sessions. Heath is a clinical psychologist, a professor of psychology at Haverford College, a dedicated and impassioned Quaker, and an explorer in the field of what "maturity" is, how it develops, how experiences in and out of institutions can hamper or nurture its development. He has a collection of data on Haverford College freshmen, much of it covering twenty years,[1] including some searching personal

[1] See Douglas Heath, *Growing Up in College* (1969), Jossey Bass, 615 Montgomery Ave., San Francisco, California 94111.

201

interview material. Beyond this, in the past three years he has been in many elementary and secondary schools, as well as other colleges, meeting with students, teachers, parents, trustees (and increasingly with representatives from all four of those groups at once). He has seen and heard plenty in the schools, and brings to what he has seen and heard the insights from his training and study in psychology and from the special subject of maturity.

Heath came on early in each of these conferences, usually after the case, the film, and one small-group meeting. We were sure we did not want any lecture-presentation from the Our Distinguished Guest type of visitor. This surely would have received the now familiar glazed-eyeball response from students, teachers, and administrators. Heath plunged in, for a start, with a description of what is now called the current youth scene. He spoke straight to students. When he said "they" or "you," he meant students, school, and college. I have often felt that the toughest job an adult can take on is to address young people with generalizations about young people. Heath can do this with a kind of insight and intensity so that again and again students would say, "That's it—he's got it—that's the way it is." When discussion and questioning would begin, he would tangle with students mostly in his generalizations about adults or in his sometimes dire predictions about the way things are drifting in the youth culture. But he touched the young people in a way that was far more than provocative, and the adults consistently joined into the spirit of real searching which developed both in the presentation and the discussion sessions. Sometimes the discussion ran on far into the night, and we had to break it up, only to find a large cluster of people corralling Heath in some corner or room or hallway for more—and more. We have printed, as an appendix to this report, a piece of writing by Douglas Heath which touches on many of the key themes he sounded in these conferences, though each of his presentations was different and, since he got different questions, comments, responses, and tones in each of the four conferences, his sessions ranged very widely indeed. What they had in common was a feeling that he was touching very closely the human needs in people and in schools. And while his focus was on students, it became clear, especially in the fifth and most recent conference, that the adults in the room not only were responding strongly to what he was describing about *students*, but were increasingly eager to have him include them in his vision of school: their needs, their problems with loneliness and apathy, and their search for their own meaning in life. Once the adults stopped speaking as professionals concerned with young people and also responded as persons dealing with their *own* humanity, we saw a new spirit come into these conferences.

session in the second conference, and the effect was electric. The story of a boy and a girl in a special school for disturbed adolescents would seem to be fairly remote from the experiences of most of the people at the conference. Yet, the developing concept of "touch" in the film (David fears physical touch as representing a threatening, killing power, actually the power to open his feelings to others), the relationship which David and Lisa create which is somehow gradually healing to each, and the extraordinary role the doctor-principal plays in their lives brought forth a response at these conferences which no amount of speech-making and discussion sessions could have created. We sometimes talked about the film together—once for over an hour, with a hundred people—supposedly an impossibility—getting a sense of what in the film had moved people, had struck them as recognizable, as somehow believable. (In the fourth conference, a student, visibly moved by the film and distressed at the rather analytical, clinical responses he was hearing in about ten minutes' talk, said "I'm interested in what has been said, and yet I would like to suggest we stop now, so we can preserve the experience each of us had with this film.") This was one of many cues we have been getting to the fact that we don't have to "discuss" as much as we used to assume we did. Even when we did discuss *David and Lisa* at length in other conferences, it was startling how the talk did not fall into standard stereotypes. Some of the most compassionate comments about the pathetic father and the (to many) ghastly mother in the film came from students. Some real understanding and feeling for the students came sometimes from a teacher or administrator. Even in a room of one hundred, it was possible at one memorable moment for a headmaster to say, "Do you think that when we all get back to our schools and into our roles, we'll remember what we felt here, looking at a screen and talking together afterwards? Can we only feel and share concern and understanding when we're free of our own responsibilities, watching a work of art, among strangers?" That question haunted that conference, and our thinking about all of the conferences.

V

BACK IN THE SCHOOLS . . .

THE return home began for many people some kind of new or renewed drive to "make something better here at home" in the schools. It also brought for many that tough, challenging experience of trying to get started again in a too-familiar workaday world after the exhilaration of being removed from it, of being a little more than one's self, of being one's self in a heightened way with other congenial spirits, all strangers. During the conferences, I heard a lot of talk about "how we're going to take this home!". "This" meant a lot of different things. Sometimes it was a specific idea that someone seized on which just had to be tried out at home: getting students, teachers, trustees, and administrators into some kind of organized conversation; breaking up full-year courses into smaller new electives: starting in on some soul searching on the student council; a reorganizing of a dormitory; "getting Douglas Heath to come and tell all that to *our* school." (Heath indeed did make a good many visits to schools, but he could obviously not make it to two hundred of them.) And one of the interesting things, in the last hours of each conference, was the way people described, in their own ways, their own awareness of what they had to do *themselves* back in school. "We can't sit around at school waiting for Heath to come and electrify everyone–we can't just sit there 'Waiting for Lefty.' " That was a teacher in his early fifties, with a memory of a powerful play by Clifford Odets, in which Lefty never did come. In another group, it was a student who said almost the same thing, though instead of Lefty he said Godot. Samuel Beckett did for him what Odets had once done–and had suddenly done again–for the teacher. Godot had never come either. But this teacher and this student were heading back to school with a feeling that it was important what each of *them* did, that there had to be something to do, and that they themselves had to be starters, furtherers.

They were doubtful about the usual return-from-a conference speech: the report to the faculty ("Mrs. Frederick, I know it's late, and we still have a lot of things to cover, but could you say a word about that Philadelphia meeting?") or the assembly speech first thing in the morning ("John and I

went to this conference in Chicago and we discussed. . . ."). There had to be other ways, and a number found them. Yet many seemed to make the old ways work with new vigor, if we are to judge by the kind of mail and telephone conversations we had in the days, weeks, or months after a conference. We sent out from NAIS a letter asking for any news, experiences, developments in the school which the conference participants would share with us, so that we could get some sense of what kind of next moves, if any, people were making in the schools. The letter went to each student, teacher, or administrator who had been to one of the five conferences, and to the head of each school from which anyone other than the head had come.

Some ran into what several called "re-entry troubles" as soon as they got back. Some found themselves so quickly involved in Doing Something that they apparently forgot to wonder if they were having re-entry troubles. One boy's experience showed both, in a heartening way. He wrote: "Everything was wrong about my getting back to school. I had trouble with the teacher on duty in the dorm, who argued about my getting back late and didn't know about the conference. Up on my floor I found everybody bitching about some business about spraying shaving cream around the common room. I found my best friend had been put on demerits for insolence to a teacher. Then, the next morning, I went to English and saw in a new way that game all those guys were playing in there–the brightest of the honor students, the most aggressive guys in school, cutting each other up, really trying to hurt each other, nobody trying to get anything really done. . . ." This boy, the next day, headed for the principal's office, and evidently something a little different happened. "He and I talked an hour and a half. No one rang his phone, or asked me where I was supposed to be or what I was missing. We talked about the conference–or I did–he listened and listened–he really seemed to want to hear what people had said, what kind of spirit we'd had there, what ideas I had coming back. . . ." A week or so later, I had a telephone call from this boy, describing a special venture he and four friends were launched on. The head had cleared the decks for this, had actually worked out the project with the five boys, each a top leader and student in the school. "We're going to make a study of education–education around the country, education right here at school. We each are freed for eight hours a week for the next fifteen weeks–we can really do a job. I've already had two sessions with the headmaster and several teachers, and we're going in our dorm on a whole new approach to dorm life. . . ." "Douglas Heath's speech and the community spirit we had there . . ." were central to his project, not as nostalgia, but as prods to affecting the quality of life in his school. "What

makes me feel so good is that we can have a chance to work—really work—in something we're directly involved in here at school—we can *affect* the school. It can be more than just talking and reading. . . ." In the next few weeks there was plenty of talking and reading, but evidently the kind that this boy thought was worth doing. They were reading everything from John Dewey to Jonathan Kozol, they were having conversations in faculty homes and dorm rooms, and were hammering away at what each of the five was actually doing, making, themselves. At the end of the fifteen weeks, I saw a copy of this boy's report on the reorganization of the dormitories, and I talked with him on the telephone about it. Again, the process of doing this job, the conversations, the readings, the midnight hassles with incoming tenth-graders, the exploration sessions with teachers and administrators, the "summit meetings" among the five boys on this special education project—all these are between the lines in the report and perhaps make up the main value of the fifteen weeks. Yet the report stands, *worked out with* the faculty and younger students, not dumped on them or placed in a file. And the whole adventure had given one boy "that chance to work in something we're directly involved in here at school." His school has something visible (and something invisible) left over from his having been there, and he himself is now starting in college having had experience in working out with other young people and adults something about the life of the institution they lived in together. It was a fifteen-weeks' experience, not one great explosion. There were plenty of frustrations, disappointments, irritations. But there were also some achievements, some human breakthroughs, something to show that "one person can affect things around here" and affect them constructively and measurably in partnership with others, within and across the generations. For the school, the value of this is obvious. For the boy, now launched in campus life involving several thousand people, there is at least the prospect of a student experience not paralyzed by apathy or a sense of inevitable helplessness, even in face of problems in the college and in the society beyond anything to do with the reorganization of school dormitories.

The most recurrent theme in the newsflashes from the conference participants was the coming together of the parts of the school community. *A guidance director:* "The interschool conversations that have sprung up all over as a result of the conference are the most valuable fallout from those three days." *A student:* "The main effect on us all here was to open the conference subjects up for school-wide talk, to make often-thought but never-spoken ideas voiceable. The conference was introduced to the school in just the way that was so vehemently denounced at the conference: a stand-up

speech on my part, with a question-and-answer period that threatened to take up most of the rest of the day. . . ." *A headmaster:* "Our teacher who came to the conference was instrumental in setting up faculty meetings through the next months which revolved almost entirely around small groups. We washed a lot of dirty linen, but I think the overall effect was to kick things off for the new year with the highest faculty morale I can remember. We even used some of the conference ideas and activities, right down to the short films and 'No Reason to Stay.' All this filtered into the plans for special senior seminars, which began with two days of human relations laboratories led by a team from Yale. This same team is now conducting a major survey of the school on personal relations in school community. . . ." *A student:* "We've got going a committee of student, administration, parent, and trustee representatives to look at the school and to meet regularly and talk about changes in the school. Bill and I alternate as student representatives. . . ." *Another student:* "I've been writing away for books and magazine articles about education–I've heard from John Holt, Project Follow Through, some writers and teachers–I'm getting ideas we can talk about together with the headmaster, in class with the teachers, with each other. . . ." *An assistant headmaster:* "We've got a lot more dialogue around here now between students and their advisors; we've got town meetings of the school which we're small enough to pull off and really make useful; students and teachers seem to be able to talk together more. And we've started to use films in ways that bring people together, that give people something to talk about *outside* of school issues, that make possible some new kinds of sharing and exploring together in school." *A student:* "We're started on a long-term project to get people from each part of the school body together each week for discussion about the school and its direction. We figure that within three years, every parent, trustee, teacher, administrator, and student will have been in one at least of these sessions where they can give an opinion and propose ideas. . . ." Again and again, from students or adults: an all-day conference, a weekend meeting, a retreat, a series of ongoing sessions, always involving students and adults (often with parents and trustees) to "talk about the school and see where we can make it better."

This kind of coming together to explore the total direction of a school and its life has really supplanted the kind of activity we heard about at first: the big student council production on the dress code, the appeal to The Administration about this rule or that regulation. This may be because so many schools have "solved" those matters during the last year and a half. It may be because more and more people are seeing those issues as symptoms or

as surfaces to crucial underlying realities in the life of the school. It may be, too, that the sweeping new desire for "community" is more interesting and more satisfying–and more important–in a school than hassling over one issue, then another, then another.

I am fairly sure that no one who returned to school missed some major frustrations, irritations, disappointments: "I presented a five-page letter to the headmaster about things that had come up in the conference about flexibility in the schedule, new courses, more relationships between students and teachers, but it seemed that it was the minor points that interested him most, the ones that didn't really make for changes or major decisions. . . ." "My faculty looked at me tolerantly, as if I was a little off my nut. . . ." "Everyone is so busy around here and so involved with what he is doing that it's hard to get anyone to pay attention to anything that doesn't explode under his own nose. . . ." Some were cautious about their hopes: "We attended a faculty meeting–the first time that has ever happened. We talked about apathy, student disaffection, the drive on grades and scores. I really think we did establish some rapport with the faculty and administration, but it may be only temporary. . . ." Others saw confusion that needed some light thrown on it. A headmaster wrote: "We need to get clear just what we bring to these joint discussions. Sometimes we make students feel they know as much as they may (or will) when they graduate from college and have taught for three years. I feel that sometimes we act as if we were listening to them as though they were experts in everything; then at other times we seem to pay no attention to them at all 'because they're just kids.' This gets students–and all of us–very confused. I'm not putting down the idea of students' role in school policy. As you know, we have ten students as voting members of our Upper School faculty. But I've come to worry about this business of role and the confusion in the way we shift our attitudes. . . ." Still others were working through concerns about motives. A teacher wrote: "We have put together a student-faculty colloquium which meets regularly to discuss topics raised by the members. We have revised our advisor-advisee arrangements so that there can be real individual and small-group discussion of things that concern people. Yet I get the feeling that we may be doing the right things for the wrong reasons. Some of the faculty and administration don't see these steps as right in themselves, as having educational value. For them, it's more a way of forestalling disturbances. We need to get it clear that we are trying to do something more than just throw something to the wolves. The administration and faculty need to see the real educational, human purpose here–something beyond responding to threatened feelings. And the students

need to see that students, faculty, and administration *can* work together and get somewhere with honesty all around. Some of them know this. The people who went to those two conferences know this. We need to make believers out of the rest of the school community."

Finally, we have heard very little of the "go home and blast them" approach. Even when we heard deep discouragement or cynicism at the conference, what we've heard since has reflected far more of the spirit of partnership than the spirit of confrontation and demands and power plays. Perhaps the times are shifting, perhaps the community spirit at the conferences has provided some kind of model. But the central theme in the back-at-school fragments we have is that of a new drive on coming together as persons to work out a better community life for the school and its "inhabitants." Isolated purposes suddenly are shared. (A headmaster wrote, "I was overjoyed to have the two students come home and hit hard on the idea of inhuman academic competitiveness and the shallow personal development that results when students are locked in too long in solo study. We're bringing the two students together with parent and trustee groups to raise just these concerns, and they can do it in ways that seem to me absolutely crucial. . . .")

I want to insert a letter here, lest all this sound too easy, too much of the "Woodstock experience without drugs," which one headmaster said seemed to be "everyone's" desire. Here is a young teacher on the tough realities he saw his school working through before and after one of the conferences:

> Toward the beginning of last year, student discontent began to affect us. Students had always been cynical about such things as student government—with good reason—but the school had never confronted the problem directly. We thought that if we could anticipate what we saw as rising unhappiness, if we could set up mechanisms to handle and channel it, we would be well ahead of the game. I see now that such anticipation, if not done slowly and carefully, will only increase discontent because of the misunderstandings that are bound to arise. (It is one thing to deal with students at a conference; it is quite another to deal with them in a school context.) Students inevitably interpret such gestures as complete freedom. They see an opportunity for their voice to be the deciding one as to what policies will be implemented. The administration, of course, never intended such.
>
> For example, we thought that we could anticipate what was happening in other schools by setting up a Student Life Committee, comprising an equal number of elected faculty and students, having policy-making power, and co-chaired by the headmaster and student government president. What the administration never really asked itself

was: Would it accept any decision the committee reached? Unfortunately, the first issue was that of student dress—an issue that starts revolutions. Students wanted free dress and saw any other policy as "image-making" and therefore hypocritical. The administration felt that the school was not yet in a position—*vis à vis* the community—to go that far. The faculty was divided, but felt that it should support the administration. After much haggling—a whole year—a compromise was reached which satisfied nobody, but two things happened along the way:

1. Everyone was bitter over the fact that they had spent so long arguing over such inane matters (although from the intensity of the struggle they obviously did not think the issue foolish). The spirit of the enterprise had been killed. Morale was lower than ever.
2. Students felt, with some justification, that the presence of the headmaster on the committee intimidated both teacher and student; yet everyone recognized that he could not escape his office. The nature of his position made him "Authority." Consequently, the polarity and mistrust between student and faculty grew.

We are now trying to reevaluate the role and function of the committee. But the problem remains: How do we—students, teachers, and administration—deal with the nature and function of authority? Furthermore, if we do decide to change, how do we go about it? There is yet another and more profound problem: How do we reach community and publicly accepted values if we state that:

1. The nature and function of a school is to help each student to grow from within, to develop his *own* sense of right and wrong.
2. The source of value and meaning lies within each individual not outside in the community and in public institutions.

Because of dissatisfaction, we have had numerous open forums, discussing problems and points of view. These forums result in raised expectations that are dashed to the ground because they are not immediately realized (we live in the age of instant gratification) or because they are not accurately understood by the students. There are other problems in such forums. The art of listening is very poor—especially in a charged atmosphere. And, under the pressure of student antipathy, the administration may make concessions or statements that are not well thought out.

To put the problem another way: The administration sees student voice and participation as advisory not binding, but usually expresses such a student role as "joint" or "participatory." Students view an advisory role as a dodge—another gimmick in the administration's bag of tricks.

> The difficulty, as I've said, is to create community value. Our progress has been slow, but not as bleak as may appear from what I have said. We are beginning to make some assumptions, to hold them in common; but whether this has come about through enervation or real communication is too soon to be known.
>
> Our school year has not been as dark as all this. I've presented the difficulties, not the rewards. Foolish as it may sound, it has been fun.

I am giving a student the final word here on the conference's impact on him and on the school: "I got a lot of frustrations out, a lot of fears of inadequacy as a student leader. I was struggling there in my own corner of a very large arena. Yet somehow the conference threw all the adversaries together in a very tight situation and forced us–adults and kids–to 'communicate'–I'm getting to hate that word! But I appreciated a lot of what the teachers and administrators were saying–and most important, I realized for the first time their extreme devotion to our education–something I have to respect, even if I disagree with their politics and strategies a lot of the time. . . . What we have to see now is if all these new efforts, all these committees on student life, all this student-faculty-administration discussing that's started actually takes us anywhere, actually brings the whole school alive to the important things, gets people feeling they belong and that their voice can be heard–that we can see some real achievements out of all this."

Appendix

STUDENT ALIENATION AND SCHOOL

by
DOUGLAS H. HEATH
Professor of Psychology
Haverford College

Reprinted, with permission, from Volume 78, No. 4 (August 1970), of *School Review*, published by The University of Chicago Press. © 1970 by The University of Chicago. All rights reserved.

WHAT a paradox! Sputnik spawned a stormy decade of ceaseless educational change and improvement. Billions of dollars have been spent to improve our educational facilities; consolidate our schools; purchase thousands of yellow school buses; expand pupil personnel services; modernize our curricula, particularly in the sciences; offer advanced placement and enrichment courses; provide elaborate language laboratories and other expensive educational technologies; and reeducate and improve the lot of our teachers.

Yet, scarcely a dozen years later, the hurricane of protests, strikes, disaffection, and calumny in our schools makes the Sputnikian days halcyon by comparison. Frightened and bewildered teachers are uncertain about the relevance of what they are doing and resented by their students. Administrators feel trapped between local Birchites attacking sex education programs and seditious students fomenting, so it is believed, rebellions against their authority; between parents complaining about school taxes and the breakdown in discipline and teachers now divided not just on issues of curriculum and discipline but on the purposes and worth of education itself.

And our students? Who can make sense of them these days? Certainly, increasing numbers of them are much more knowledgeable, impressively alert to the currents of the world, more morally sensitive and perceptive, less imprisoned by the illusions and myths we adults have long taken for reality. Yet, increasing numbers also seem to be deeply bored and apathetic, even

out of frustration and restlessness we turn to more intensive external events that will "turn us on." So how does a youth nowadays get his kicks? He retreats to his room to immerse himself in the deafening roar of folk rock. Or he seeks out a band whose music is so loud and encompassing that he actually feels physical, perhaps erotic, vibrations in his groin. Or he turns to drugs that help him "blow his mind," that is, his inhibitions, in order to make him feel alive again, to experience a range and intensity of feelings he cannot experience on his own, to come to know that life can be "beautiful." Sensitivity, marathon, or encounter groups have become enormously popular with young people in our culture, and variants of these procedures are beginning to flood the schools and colleges. Our youth now need institutionalized ways by which to learn how to feel like children again, how to communicate emotionally with another, how to recover a primitive emotional wholeness that has been "cooled" out of them. Folk rock, drugs, and *T* groups are ways to recover a sense of integration or wholeness in which feeling becomes re-fused in awareness with thought. Is it any wonder that teachers from all parts of the country say they have to work harder to keep their students with them, that English teachers have been forced to teach more bizarre and "way out" literature, that many of us are forced to use more dramatic, vivid, current materials?

I do not fear that student activists or their errant aggressiveness will "destroy" our schools and colleges. At least they are alive and kicking, though I do not enjoy being kicked. I fear, instead, that a much larger number of our students are becoming turned off, overly inhibited, tight, passive, the walking dead. Our problem as educators is to help them become actively and emotionally involved with their lives, to help them learn not to be so passively dependent upon something "out there" for entertainment, to help them learn how to tolerate the pain of frustration and boredom without fleeing into drugs or intellectual stupor.

Estrangement from Others

All of us have been lonely at times, though some much more so than others. But this younger generation is a lonelier one. Perhaps they are more aware of their isolation than their parents have been, for they do not have to preoccupy themselves with long hours of work to survive. Our affluence guarantees the satisfaction of their survival needs. My data suggest that the trend is for 17-year-olds to feel less tied to other persons, groups, and even their own country. Some statistics may be helpful at this point to illustrate my observations. I report the percentage of "true" replies for every fourth

year of 17-year-olds entering my own college since the end of World War II:

	STUDENTS ENTERING IN					
	'48-'49	'52	'56	'60	'64	'68
When I was a child I didn't care to be a member of a crowd or gang.	33	35	35	38	49	47
I could be happy living all alone in a cabin in the woods or mountains.	23	28	31	38	33	45
My worries seem to disappear when I get into a crowd of lively friends.	71	69	73	68	58	55
I am a good mixer.	77	49	48	63	60	43

It is not that young people do not value close friendships. They do—perhaps more than their parents ever did. They dare not risk initiating such relationships because many do not have the social skills and confidence to be able to get close to someone else. Thirty-seven percent of the senior men graduating from Berkeley in one class said they had never made a close friend in college, almost a third of the men and 25 percent of the women at Stanford said they had never had a "date" while at the university. Forty percent of our own entering freshmen have said they feel very lonely.

But we are not built to be isolated individuals, not to be touched or to touch, despite those young people who hide their loneliness behind slogans of self-sufficiency and "do your own thing" or who escape into a Simon and Garfunkel lyric like

> Hiding in my room, safe within my womb
> I touch no one and no one touches me.
> I am a rock
> I am an island
> And a rock feels no pain
> And an island never cries.

The "in" words are openness, trust, love, and community—words that express need for the intimacy and belongingness that so many report their lives now lack.

How are our youth seeking to overcome their estrangement from others? The hippie commune, the conspiratorial drug group, the mass confrontation that, ironically, provides for many their first meaningful experience of human solidarity and community, create some transitory experiences of acceptance and belongingness. Again, the attraction of the encounter or sensitivity group is that it too provides a glimpse of what intimacy could be. Despite their artificiality, some of these groups prove difficult to terminate. But it is primarily through sexual relations that increasing numbers of our young

people will seek to escape loneliness and to learn interpersonal intimacy. It is not that they pursue sexual experiences just for hedonistic or erotic pleasure. Sex is becoming the means of learning how to relate more openly and trustingly with another.

Now if it is true, as my studies and those of other researchers suggest, that the quality of interpersonal relationships, particularly with peers, in adolescence is the primary determinant of maturing, including intellectual growth, then we need to reexamine our educational practices and structures to discover how they accentuate our students' isolation and estrangement from each other. Is it really healthy for private schools and colleges to build new dormitories that provide single rooms to which students can too readily retreat when faced by a crisis in their personal relationships? As educational technology gives us the opportunity to individualize instruction for each child, do we risk separating him even further from cooperative social learning experiences? Should we not also reemphasize team study or research projects in order to help a youth learn how to listen, cooperate, and share with another? Perhaps by working with someone else on a common task he will learn how to communicate with and care for another person.

Estrangement from Traditions

The intellectual, religious, and political assumptions that served as the core of our adult identities provided us with some certainty and assured us that our lives were meaningful and purposeful. These assumptions are but myths for growing numbers of young people. And they are less and less willing to commit themselves to myths or illusions. No longer is disciplined intelligence, apotheosized in science and technology, viewed as a means of salvation by many of our brightest youngsters. Increasingly, they reject the rationalistic academicism and scientism that have produced hydrogen bombs, destroyed the beauty of their earth, and automated them. Nor do our traditional religious beliefs and practices appeal to the many young people who find God, miracles, heaven and hell, prayer, and the Bible irrelevant to this secular world.[2] Nor is there any real conviction that there is some divine plan, purpose, or absolutistic principle to discover. The Puritanistic ethic has lost its hold for a pleasure-seeking "now" generation. Our black and Vietnamese tragedies and the unresponsiveness of our government to the heightened moral consciousness of many of this generation have unmasked the hollowness of our democratic myths.

The consequences of this profound change in value have been a deepening gloom and hopelessness. For the first time a generation confronts a world in

which there seem to be no viable alternatives to uncertainty, purposelessness, and meaninglessness.

But, again, human beings are not built psychologically to live absurdly or contingently. We are built to believe, to seek meaning and purpose, and to create order. To find some certainty and truth, more and more are turning inward, a process accentuated by drugs and the failure of adult leaders to provide channels through which the moral idealism of our youth can be expressed. "If I can no longer trust any authority—that of our intellectual, religious, and political traditions and leaders—then at least I can trust myself and my judgment." Thus, it is not surprising to learn that whereas after World War II 25 percent of 17-year-olds entering college thought they were important persons, nowadays 56 percent believe so. Nor is it surprising that large numbers of our young people now organize their values around psychedelia and the aesthetic way of life; the criteria for the true, right, or good become one's own feelings and inner life. If an experience is beautiful—even a drug-induced hallucination—that is the only justification it needs. Truth has no objective basis. Nor is a teacher's competence any longer compelling to a youth who finds his own truth in subjective reactions. The Woodstock festival tells us that the emerging sacraments of the new subjectivism are folk rock and drugs.

These trends challenge us to discover how to help our youth learn to live with uncertainty, how to nurture faith and hope, how to develop more mature values. Is not the real meaning of the generation gap our failure as adults to be models of hope and vision that speak to the 1984 world into which young people are moving?

What do our youth need to become more mature and educable? They certainly do not just need to learn more information or to sharpen their abstract verbal skills. By overemphasizing narrow academicism we risk making many of our more sensitive and intelligent youths even more unamenable to further intellectual growth. What I have learned from the hippies, the drug devotees, and the activists is that we educators have failed to speak to the needs of young people to grow more wholely. They need to learn to spontaneously express their affectionate and appreciative feelings. They need to learn to develop more intimate cooperative relationships. They need to learn to act responsibly in actual encounters with meaningful problems in order to test their emerging values and, in Van Doren's words, their "skills of being." They need to learn to reflect upon experiences in which they have had to integrate their knowledge and intellectual capacities, emotional needs, social ideals, and interpersonal skills. To provide only traditional academic

training for this generation of students is to risk estranging it even more from itself and souring it to the potential beauty of life as well as to the pressing human needs of our society.

Societal Causes of Alienation

The trends I've described are obviously the product of many complex societal factors. We are in the midst of a historic transition in the power of different societal institutions to have maturing effects on young people. The family, neighborhood, and church are rapidly losing their power to nurture emotional spontaneity, cooperative, intimate, and caring attitudes and skills, and stable integrative values. The mass media, peer culture, and school increasingly dominate the life space of our youth and are inducing passivity and emotional inhibition, conformity and impersonalization, and conflicting and unstable values.

The decline in the power of the traditional neighborhood and the church to further the growth of youngsters has already been well described by Bronfenbrenner[3] and others. Despite the widespread conviction that there have been marked changes in the atmosphere and child-rearing practices of white middle-class families in the past decades, remarkably little information is available to document such a trend. My own meager data suggest there have been no dramatic changes in either permissiveness or affective tone during the past two decades. What may have happened is that the typical family is now no longer as protected or guarded from the influences of other forces in our society. The consequence is that our children may watch on television as other people fight, kill each other, decide what to buy, live in excessive splendor, make love, disobey parents, and so on. They become aware very early of every adult secret, our perversities and weaknesses, our conflicting ways of life. They see every disaster, relive the assassinations of their heroes, and suffer their funeral marches along Pennsylvania Avenue. Since we adults also are now uncertain about what we believe, our children no longer encounter many stable, convincing models of values.

The mass media, peer culture, and the schools have also been encroaching on the family by usurping more and more hours of a youth's time. If it is true that the average child looks at television some thousand hours a year, we must ask from where that time comes. The answer is that it is taken from family activities, from play with friends, from hobbies, and from other emotional and social experiences in which a child formerly learned how to develop communicative, interpersonal, and coping skills. How many hours does it take to learn how to argue without turning off, to listen to others, to

cooperate in setting rules and then accommodate to them, to empathize, sympathize, and care for another? Surely we are not born with such skills. Instead, television teaches a child to watch passively, experience vicariously, and perceive impressionistically. Whereas a child used to learn playful skills and attitudes with which to cope with boredom later in life, now television prepares the child to be a bored adolescent. Why? Human experience is finite. There are only so many human emotions, crises, and ways of coping with them. To keep our attention, the media must present us with novelty. What happens to a child who too early has been to the moon, Biafra, or Vietnam? The second and third trips become dreadfully routine. So television must go way out—to the more intense, perverse, or bizarre—in order to stay "in." Now, each of us knows that when we see violence, for example, we become tense and perhaps even a little angry ourselves. Since most middle-class families do not permit children to hit each other, they have few ways by which to express their aroused tensions. They learn to inhibit their feelings. After thousands of hours of this conditioning does not one become insensitive to the massacres at Pinkville and does not one need the release of marijuana?

Any adult who is close to adolescents knows how powerfully the peer culture affects their values and attitudes. When Bob Dylan says everyone must get stoned, the Beatles visit a guru, and Mick Jagger gets a girl pregnant outside of marriage, then millions of young people get the message. It does not take more than a few weeks for a new idea or behavior or mode of dress to spread around the world. An ethos, an expectancy, even a mystique, evolves of what an "in" adolescent should do and believe. I have visited schools in rural New Hampshire, suburban Texas, metropolitan Chicago, and the backwoods of British Columbia. The students read the same "in" authors, assert the same slogans and opinions, wear the same pins, and talk the same language, whether about pot or sex or authority. We have a truly national but homogenized and conforming culture nowadays in which the real educators of our adolescents' values are our Dylans and Jaggers. The persistent attack on convention, tradition, and the authority of those over thirty leaves a vacuum into which our charismatic hard-rock anti-heroes stride.

Because most of us do not understand the hidden needs of our students or the effects that the mass media and their peer culture have upon them, we institute innovations in our schools that only accentuate the alienation of students. Have we educators asked ourselves just what is our responsibility for the increasing boredom, social alienation, accentuated intellectual narcissism, and indiscriminate repudiation of tradition?

The Effects of the Schools

The advent of Sputnik, James Conant's recommendations, and collegiate competition profoundly affected the direction and structure of our school system. One principal effect was the improvement of the academic quality of our schools. Academic excellence became the rallying slogan and sole criterion against which the quality of the school was to be judged. Human excellence,[4] the historic goal of all major educational philosophers since Socrates, was eclipsed. Central to academic improvement was the belief that excellence required a major structural change in the size of the school. To provide comprehensive education that included diverse and specialized courses, better facilities, and guidance services, many states mandated the consolidation of small schools into large schools. In Pennsylvania, for example, small high schools of 400–600 students that unquestionably offered high-quality education were forced to merge to create high schools of several thousand students.

What has been the effect of such large, superbly equipped schools upon their students? First, there is remarkably little evidence that the alleged benefits of a large school, like better science facilities or more language courses, make any noticeable contribution to any educational outcome.[5] Neither the school's holding power, students' scholastic achievement, subsequent performance in college, satisfaction with their school experience, nor students' self-esteem and competence have been improved significantly.[6] Second, recent evidence suggests that the crucial educational determinants of a student's development are the humanistic climate or atmosphere of the school, the student's sense of participant involvement, and the student's identification with the purposes of the faculty.[7] Third, there seems to be an inverse relation between the school's size and any of these atmospheric and motivational determinants.[8] That is, the larger the school, the more impersonal and bureaucratic its atmosphere becomes, the less students are involved in activities, and the less they identify with the academic purposes of the faculty. Fourth, in contrast to so much educational research that frequently produces contradictory results, the evidence about the psychological effects of a large school is impressively consistent. For example, it is clear that as a school grows, the number of its extracurricular organizations does not increase proportionately. Students in large schools participate in fewer activities and hold fewer positions of leadership and responsibility than students in smaller schools. They encounter their friends less often and have less contact with the adults of their school.[9] There is a direct relation between the size of the school and the frequency of cheating

by its students. Interestingly, students in large schools take more specialized courses and so do not have the same intellectual breadth as do students in smaller schools. Students in large schools tend to be more competitive and develop a narrower conception of their own worth. Teachers in large schools do not talk about students with other teachers as frequently; they give less personal help. Their faculty meetings are concerned more with administrative than with educational policy questions. Finally, guidance personnel are found to be less effective in large schools, primarily because they do not know their students within the full context of their activities in the school.[10]

The evidence is highly suggestive that we educators have misidentified the crucial determinants of a student's growth. Our singular pursuit of academic excellence, defined by narrow academic considerations, may have improved the academic preparation of some students but may also have narrowed their sense of competence, limited their self-esteem, and made increasing numbers of them closed to subsequent intellectual growth.[11] Our large schools with their associated impersonality, rigidities, and bureaucratic, frequently authoritarian atmospheres fail to provide the opportunities for young persons to know many other persons well and to be known in any more than a few roles within the school. The large school is, indeed, a "system" and does become the model of the Establishment against which to develop antisystem and, perhaps, by extension, antisocietal attitudes. The large school is the one system young people *do* know well. Obviously, many other characteristics of a school may also contribute to the student's estrangement from his own emotional life, from other students, and from his traditional sources of values, like democratic assumptions. Authoritarian attitudes of teachers; domination of teachers in the classroom; the lecture style of dispensing information; the restriction of the teacher to a specialty, particularly in the elementary school where no one person now knows a child all the way around as a person; accelerated courses, particularly in the sciences; the failure of the schools to deal with value conflicts; and a host of other factors may also fuel the trend toward greater boredom, belonginglessness, and purposelessness.

How shall we react to the growing educational crises we face, to the confusion and gloom that pervade faculty meetings, to the resignation that seems to be on the rise? We could seize the opportunity that despair always presents to begin to reorder our educational priorities. We could reaffirm our historic commitment to the goal of promoting maturing and educability. If human excellence is our commitment, then we will not use academic achievement, frequently too narrowly defined, as the only measure of the

effectiveness of our schools. We will not introduce new educational technologies like television or computer-assisted instruction solely on the basis of their claims that they will increase the amount of information learned; we will also ask what their emotionally inhibiting and impersonalizing effects might be. We will not build larger schools or educational parks and fail to assess their effects on the quality of our students' personal relationships, their sense of belonging to the school, and their feelings of self-worth. We will not continue to lecture at our students, reinforce their pervasive passivity and suppress their spontaneity, and rob them of the opportunity to learn to initiate and direct their own educational growth. I would urge all educators to consider the effects of what they do within the context of our youths' needs to become more accepting of their own emotional needs, more open, trusting, and skillful in their relations with others, and more aware of how to develop mature values. Apathy, loneliness, and meaninglessness challenge us to develop an educational environment that helps each youth to develop more integratively and so more humanly.

NOTES

1. Those interested in the basic studies and actual data may wish to read my *Growing Up in College: Liberal Education and Maturity* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1968).

2. D.H. Heath, "Secularization and Maturity of Religious Beliefs," *Journal of Religion and Health 8,* no. 4 (1969): 335-58.

3. U. Bronfenbrenner, "The Split Society: Children versus Adults," *Cornell Alumnus News* (September 1968).

4. I have tried to define this vague goal more precisely in *Growing Up in College.*

5. J.S. Coleman, *Equality of Educational Opportunity* (Washington, D.C.: Office of Education, 1966); A.W. Tamminen and G.D. Miller, *Guidance Programs and Their Impact on Students* (Saint Paul: Office of Education and Pupil Personnel Services Section, Minnesota Department of Education, 1968).

6. Tamminen and Miller.

7. Coleman; Tamminen and Miller; Heath, *Growing Up in College.*

8. Tamminen and Miller; Heath, *Growing Up in College;* R.G. Barker and P.V. Gump, *Big School, Small School: High School Size and Student Behavior* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1964); A. Chickering, *Project on Student Development at Selected Small Colleges,* National Institute of Mental Health, 3d Annual Report (Chevy Chase, Md.: National Institute of Mental Health, 1968).

9. D.H. Heath, "School Size: The Effect on Adjustment and Social Contact of High School Seniors" (in preparation).

10. Tamminen and Miller.

11. D.H. Heath, "Better Educated: Less Educable?" in *The Time Has Come Today,* ed. S. Letter (New York: Teachers College Press, in press).

same school who had attended the second conference a year before. We wondered about schools' repeating, and realized, with a good deal of help from certain school people, how valuable it was to have the repeats. One school sent a mathematics teacher fifteen hundred miles to attend the second conference. He returned to school and met with his headmaster, with colleagues, with other students, and the school sent two students to the next conference and the headmaster to the one after that. These four people later wrote that they had much more of a feeling of solidarity and sharing, more of a sense that they could work together for concerns they had, right in the school, than would have been true if they had been simply single returnees from a good experience, making their assembly or faculty meeting reports.

A look at any of the groups on the second day (the last four conferences went from Sunday noon through Tuesday afternoon) showed plenty of variety in styles. Dress ranged from comfortably sedate to—by some standards—fascinatingly bizarre. Only once in the five conferences was I asked whether ties were required at meals. (I answered that people should wear what they wanted to.) Some shoes came off toward the end of the conference, and blue jeans appeared out of what must have been some large suitcases, bringing plenty of options in dress style among girls and boys. We had the whole gamut in hair lengths on the boys, and impressive and incipient beards here and there on boys and men. Whatever a school's policy, it was clear that these matters would not be an issue during these three days, except in the talk about schools back home.

I was fascinated and encouraged to see that people seemed to develop a freedom to "be themselves." All the students didn't seem to have to emerge in hippie outfits or overalls, any more than they "had" to show up in button-downs and greys. All of the adults didn't feel they were being nonrelevant if they kept their ties on, or self-consciously swinging if they didn't. Some of the small groups gradually moved the furniture to the wall and sat on the floor. Some didn't, but could have if they had wanted to. I came into my group once, for its fourth meeting in one of the conferences, and found, after the group had previously been comfortably seated around a horseshoe table arrangement, saying that was what they wanted, that this time three students and a teacher were already settled sociably on the floor rug, backs against the wall, talking. As one of NAIS's staff people, and the listed leader of this group, I thought quickly about my own choice. The teacher beckoned me down beside him, and I joined him. While we talked, I began to hope very much that the next people coming in would choose where and how they wanted to be, and would not be drawn onto the floor to show

they were floor people or to be with-it, or, for that matter, to choose a chair or table in order to be dignified rather than comfortable. To my delight, the next two teachers, one a lady with a narrow skirt, quite matter-of-factly came in, pulled up chairs, leaning elbows and a note pad or two on a drawn-up table. Next came a third teacher, who found a place on the rug, and finally, a student who hopped up on one of the tables and stayed there. This sounds trivial as I write it, but I know that it demonstrated something to me about personal styles and group styles, about the complexity of this whole business of "atmosphere," and the folly of some current group-dynamics approaches which dictate so rigidly the enforced informalities and unbuttoned "naturalness" which may be as unhelpful to some people seeking genuine exchange of views and straightforward encounters between persons as the old enforced starched collar and meeting-of-the-board behavior was to others. You *can* have it both ways—or a whole lot of ways—if in the room there is some respect and trust and real interest in each other's humanity—as well as individuality.

In the evenings, we found a number of different things developing. After the evening session was over, by about ten, some were talked out and glad to relax and drink a coke and watch some short films ("The Moods of Surfing," "Ski the Outer Limits," "Americans on Everest," "Time Piece," and others) which were visually beautiful or funny or provocative, but there purposely was no organized discussion of any of them. At other times, groups would gather somewhere to pursue a theme that had been crucial in one of the sessions, as in one evening's two-hour pow-wow on black and white relations in the schools, with a brilliant and articulate (and fiery and delightful) black senior in a girls' school in a conversation with two other people, which grew into a huddled summit meeting of fifteen students and eight adults. Sometimes, people drifted off to their rooms and into random conversations there or in any rooms where people were gathered, or in halls, where there might be a few people clustered around an ignored TV set or playing lifting-balance "trust games."

Over the year and a half, NAIS got only three calls or letters ahead of time about what the chaperone setup would be at the conference. We could answer only that we would be in a motel, hotel, or conference center, with other guests staying there, and that the school should send students whose judgment they trusted. We would do no chaperoning, room checking, or any such head counting. This would work directly against the kind of spirit we were assuming and working from in the whole conference. We are fairly sure that there was not much sleep during the two nights the conference included.

Heath speaks for himself eloquently in the statement printed here. What struck hardest in these conferences was his vision of these realities:

The sense of powerlessness: "I think one of the greatest causes of despair among this generation is the strong sense of what is right combined with the belief in your inability to do anything about it. That leads to a severe sense of impotence."

Pervasive boredom: "The surrounding culture is enormously stimulating, actually sexually arousing. TV explores every kind of novelty which you can absorb passively and 'know all about' quite early in life. And conflicts, inner and outer, are so intense that one can protect one's self by withdrawing into a kind of defensive apathy."

Passivity: "TV, school, the culture encourages 'watchers.' When you get into action, you have to keep your cool. It's easier to stay in the state of passivity than to come out and do something."

Keeping one's cool: "We human beings are not built to inhibit tension and feeling, to be passive, to be non-expressive people. We are built with tear glands with which to cry, large muscles with which to act. . . . We are driven to seek ways to blow our cool—more intense stimulation to turn on—drugs, a riot—anything to allow this breaking out of the cool. . . ."

Privatism: "There are more and more young people who have no experience in making friends, in having close friendships, in actually living with people."

Increasing sexual activity: "We are seeing an increasing sexualization of relationships, but I think this is not for erotic pleasure, as adults assume. I think this sexualization of relationships is a means to acquire intimacy."

The drive for academic achievement: "For too long students have been pushed to perform, to achieve, with a tiny portion of their personalities. Too much development in one area of the personality brings a reaction in the rest of the personality—we are seeing a virulent anti-rationalism, anti-intellectualism lashing out from students expertly trained and force-fed in rationality and intellectualism."

Now-ness: "There is such a feeling of imminence—we must do our thing now—the future is too far away and you can't affect it anyway."

Despair about "the world out there": "It is not human to tolerate meaninglessness too long without doing something. There is so much hopeful questioning and seeking all around—don't cop out and resign

from life and society–join in whatever seems to be working toward a more healthy life for the kind of society we would like to see developing. There is an answer to boredom, loneliness and meaninglessness in productive work–in love–in the commitment to the betterment of the lives of others and of your society. This takes patience, skill–you have to *learn* the skills–and face up to sustained effort and responsible action–and somehow, much faith."

Education for a changing world: "How does one prepare a youth for a world in which knowledge never brings a final solution but only more problems; in which facts learned today are no longer facts but biases, or at least not relevant to 1984? To be able to adapt to such continuous change means continuous learning and unlearning. Now, man's brain cannot store an infinite amount of information. Increasingly, more of us will find that we are becoming marginal members of our society, requiring the memories of computer-retrieval systems to be able to survive. We shall no longer have to be educated to be reasonably self-sufficient in informational background. The sheer magnitude of the information we already require our students to process and organize is already reaping resistance to further growth. I detect a strong trend in many students–and in their parents–to ignore the amount of complete information they need to form reasonable decisions. Too many students are fleeing into simplistic ideologies–whether it be the "law-and-order" theme of the right or the participatory democracy slogan of the New Left. The thinking of too many of my students is becoming polarized and closed to possibilities. Ideological-like thinking, of any color, reduces a person's educability; he fails to think contextually. Ideology becomes a convenient slogan and a simplified set of rules by which to avoid the effort to make some sense out of the confusing patterns of change."[1]

These ideas, challenges, and probes somehow freed people to come into action, not only with each other and with Douglas Heath during his session, but in conversations far into the night and, as we have seen, back in the schools. Most exciting to many of us have been the fragments of a vision of what education could become: a coming together of what is coldly called the affective and the cognitive, a commitment of feelings and rational powers *together* to learning to live and work in and for life itself.

The most moving response to Douglas Heath's sessions were to his vision of lonely people closed off from each other, unable to blow their cool, incapable of making friendships, of being loving. We scheduled Frank and Eleanor Perry's extraordinary 1962 film, *David and Lisa,* after the first Heath

[1] Douglas Heath, "Education for 1984," *The Independent School Bulletin,* October 1969.

gloomy and despairing, resentful, purposeless, uncommitted and privatistic. Within only a few years, more have come to accept as viable options for their lives the possibilities of becoming addicted to drugs or mentally ill. They speak of suicide more openly now. They increasingly reject the claims of traditional authorities and the way of life of their achieving, puritanistic, but joyless, middle-class parents. The hippie and drug routes do speak to the suppressed needs of more youth than we may wish to admit. Of their schools they think: irrelevant, boring, repressive, joyless. The more articulate students say they are prisoners of a dehumanized "system" that makes them feel like "niggers." Increasing numbers repudiate requirements, grades, achievement, and competitiveness. Listen to this poignant comment of a Berkeley senior who had the highest grade-point average of his graduating class:

> The first thing I would like to say to you is that it was not worth it . . . [in the pursuit of grades, he had become] subject to a paralyzing mental machinery: if I did not study twelve hours a day, compose at the speed of 1000 words an hour while writing a paper, go through required reading at 33 pages an hour, I was a failure. I pushed myself until I was more enchained than a Russian factory worker in the 1930s. [His longing for human contact, he said] would come at night as I walked home from the library. I would look at the lights in the windows and think to myself: behind those windows are people—real, live, human, fleshy, thinking, feeling, loving, despairing people. I am out here and they are in there. They will never come out here to me, and they would never allow me to come inside to them.

The paradox is that the post-Sputnikian educational changes that brought impressive material improvements to our schools intensified faculty uncertainty about their proper goals and student alienation from and repudiation of their schools. I propose that

1. Our youth have been undergoing characterological changes that are alienating them from their emotional needs, from each other, and from traditional communal sources of values. Boredom, loneliness, and meaninglessness are the emerging leitmotifs.

2. These changes are caused by an historic and irreversible transition in the power of different social institutions to have educative and maturing effects on the young. Intimate, face-to-face, primary groups like the family, neighborhood, and church are losing their educative power. Increasingly, conforming, impersonal, secondary agencies like the mass media, peer culture, and the school are controlling and shaping the development of young people.

3. Because we educators have been blind to this shift in influence and power and its psycho-social consequences, we have grievously misidentified

how our young people need to develop. We have unwittingly supported structural and policy changes in our educational system that have compounded student alienation. We have become only more confused about what our principal educational goals should be.

Characterological Changes

What does it mean that students are becoming increasingly more bored, lonely, and purposeless—signs of a growing estrangement from themselves, others, and their own traditions?

I speak primarily of affluent, white, middle-class college-bound suburban and metropolitan high school students, for these are the ones I have been talking with in many parts of the country and on whom I have some psychological test data since the end of World War II. I speak of trends that have been emerging since that time and do not imply that I describe a majority of 17-year-olds—yet.[1] My concern is that such trends may describe the majority in five or ten years.

Estrangement from Self

Boredom has several psychological roots: diminished vitality, withdrawal of interest, defensive constriction of the personality because of too severe internal strife, overstimulation, a passive orientation to life. The boredom of contemporary students seems also to be related to a pervasive inhibition of impulse. It may seem quixotic to speak of a deepening inhibition when one thinks of our long-haired psychedelic young people. Yet, their own words betray their own inhibition: to be cool, hung up, up tight, in a box. My data suggest that for the past two decades there has been an increase in the number of students who overcontrol their impulses, who are serious and conscientious, who feel under some strain to meet the increased expectations of society and their schools. To be "cool" is to maintain self-control in order not to give the appearance of being emotional, nostalgic, sentimental, dependent, weak, tender, affectionate, enthusiastic, or committed. A youth cannot afford to allow himself to be "vulnerable" and risk being rejected and hurt. The consequence is that he shies away from childish self-abandon, adolescent pranks and playful humor, party stunts, informal group singing, and other activities in which he risks "blowing his cool." Young people talk of being separated intellectually from their emotional needs, of being empty inside.

Of course, we humans are not built to cut ourselves off from our feelings, to feel dead inside. If we cannot be spontaneous and express emotion, then